

Online Research @ Cardiff

This is an Open Access document downloaded from ORCA, Cardiff University's institutional repository: <https://orca.cardiff.ac.uk/id/eprint/109589/>

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted to / accepted for publication.

Citation for final published version:

Festante, Fabrizia, Vanderwert, Ross ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2280-8401>, Sclafani, Valentina, Paukner, Annika, Simpson, Elizabeth, Suomi, Stephen J, Fox, Nathan and Ferrari, Pier Francesco 2018. EEG beta desynchronization during hand goal-directed action observation in newborn monkeys and its relation to the emergence of hand motor skills. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience* 30 , pp. 142-149.
10.1016/j.dcn.2018.02.010 file

Publishers page: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2018.02.010>
<<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2018.02.010>>

Please note:

Changes made as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing, formatting and page numbers may not be reflected in this version. For the definitive version of this publication, please refer to the published source. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite this paper.

This version is being made available in accordance with publisher policies.

See

<http://orca.cf.ac.uk/policies.html> for usage policies. Copyright and moral rights for publications made available in ORCA are retained by the copyright holders.



Title: EEG Beta desynchronization during hand goal-directed action observation in newborn monkeys and its relation to the emergence of hand motor skills

Running title: EEG suppression to observed grasping actions in newborn monkeys

Authors: Fabrizia Festante ¹, Ross E. Vanderwert ², Valentina Sclafani ³, Annika Paukner ⁴, Elizabeth A. Simpson ⁵, Stephen J. Suomi ⁴, Nathan A. Fox ⁶ and Pier Francesco Ferrari ^{1,7}

Affiliations: ¹ Dip. di Medicina e Chirurgia, Università di Parma, Parma, 43125, ITALY; ² Cardiff University Centre for Human Developmental Science, School of Psychology, Cardiff University, Cardiff, CF10 3AT, UK; ³ Winnicott Research Unit, University of Reading, Reading, RG6 6AL, UK; ⁴ Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, National Institutes of Health, Poolesville, 20837, USA; ⁵ Dept. of Psychology, University of Miami, Coral Gables, Florida, 33146, USA; ⁶ Dept. Of Human Development and Quantitative Methodology, University of Maryland, College Park, 20740, USA; ⁷ Institut des Sciences Cognitives Marc Jeannerod, CNRS, Bron, Cedex 69675, France.

Corresponding author: Fabrizia Festante

Email: fabrizia.festante@nemo.unipr.it

Work Phone: +39 3208624674

Address: Dip. di Medicina e Chirurgia, Università di Parma, Via Gramsci 14,
Parma, 43125, ITALY.

Abstract

Previous developmental research suggests that motor experience supports the development of action perception across the lifespan. However, it is still unknown *when* the neural mechanisms underlying action-perception coupling emerge in infancy. The goal of this study was to examine the neural correlates of action perception during the emergence of grasping abilities in newborn rhesus macaques. Neural activity, recorded via electroencephalogram (EEG), while monkeys observed grasping actions, mimed actions, and means-end movements during the first (W1) and second week (W2) of life was measured. Event-related desynchronization (ERD) during action observation was computed from the EEG in the alpha and beta bands, two components of the sensorimotor mu rhythm associated with activity of the mirror neuron system (MNS). Results revealed age-related changes in the beta band, but not the alpha band, over anterior electrodes, with greater desynchronization at W2 than W1 for the observation of goal-directed grasping actions. Additionally, desynchronization to observed grasping actions at W2 was associated with infants' motor skills – measured by a separate behavioral task – such that more grasping attempts were associated to greater beta ERD. These findings suggest the emergence of an early action-perception system that relies on motor experience, shortly after birth.

Keywords: Development; Mu Rhythm; ERD; Mirror neuron system; Grasping actions; Electroencephalogram

1.1 Introduction

The connection between motor development and the emergence of social and cognitive abilities has been widely investigated in both human and nonhuman primates (Ferrari et al., 2009; Kaburu et al., 2016; Marshall and Meltzoff, 2014, 2011; Woodward and Gerson, 2014). Human infants begin to show the capacity to infer others' motor goals at the end of the first year of life, as developments in their self-produced actions contribute to improved perception of how others interact with their surrounding environment (Hunnius and Bekkering, 2014; Sommerville et al., 2005; Woodward and Gerson, 2014). The Mirror Neuron System (MNS), which activates during both the execution and the observation of goal directed actions, might represent an important neural correlate of this action-perception coupling. Since the initial discovery of mirror neurons in the premotor and parietal cortices of the adult macaque (Bonini et al., 2010; di Pellegrino et al., 1992; Fogassi et al., 2005; Gallese et al., 1996), it has been hypothesized that the MNS might mediate higher cognitive functions such as action understanding and imitation (Rizzolatti et al., 2001). The proposed mechanism through which the MNS operates relies on mapping the description of an observed action onto one's own motor representation. Such sensory-motor mapping would support the observer's embodied access to the meaning of the observed action; thus making the motor system central to both controlling the movement of the body in space and supporting cognitive functions related to the decoding of others' actions (Gallese et al., 1996; Rizzolatti et al., 2001).

The electroencephalogram (EEG) is a non-invasive approach to measure brain activity in developmental populations, and is widely used to investigate infant motor and cognitive development, in particular through the investigation of a specific sensorimotor rhythm, called the mu rhythm (Marshall and Meltzoff, 2011; Vanderwert et al., 2013). In human adults, this EEG oscillation falls within the alpha (8-13 Hz) and beta (15-30 Hz) frequency bands, and is recorded over central scalp locations, corresponding to sensorimotor areas (Fox et al., 2016; Hari and Salmelin, 1997; Pineda, 2005). The mu rhythm typically desynchronizes (i.e., decreases in spectral power) during both the execution of intentional motor acts and the observation of actions performed by others (Fox et al.,

2016; Neuper and Pfurtscheller, 2001; Pineda, 2005). For this reason, desynchronization of mu rhythm (of both its components: alpha and beta) has been suggested to reflect the activation of the motor system and, indirectly, of the MNS, in both humans (Avanzini et al., 2012; Babiloni et al., 2002; Fox et al., 2016; Muthukumaraswamy and Johnson, 2004; Pineda, 2005) and monkeys (Coudé et al., 2014; Ferrari et al., 2012; Vanderwert et al., 2015).

An analogue of the adult mu rhythm has been described in human infants, starting from about the sixth month of life (Marshall et al., 2002). The infant mu rhythm peaks at lower frequencies than the adult mu rhythm (around 6–9 Hz for alpha and 15-17 Hz for beta), has a more diffuse scalp distribution (Marshall and Meltzoff, 2011; Thorpe et al., 2016) and desynchronizes during both executed and observed actions (Nyström et al., 2011; Southgate et al., 2010, 2009). Critically, infant mu suppression is strongly affected by the infant's own motor competences. For example, Cannon et al. (2016) found that 9-month-old infants' motor proficiency correlated with the strength of the mu desynchronization during action observation and that desynchronization during action execution was directly associated with maturity of infants' grasping skills. van Elk and colleagues (2008) studied the effects of spontaneous EEG variations in 14- to 16-month-old infants while observing movies of other infants crawling or walking. They found greater desynchronization in both sensorimotor alpha and beta bands while infants observed crawling, a more developed motor pattern in their repertoire, compared to walking. Moreover, they found a correlation between infants' experience crawling and their mu reactivity. Further, Yoo and colleagues (2015) reported that 12- but not 9-month-old infants' motor competences correlated with their mu desynchronization when they observed goal-directed actions performed with a tool. Finally, Gerson and colleagues (2015) experimentally manipulated motor experience by giving 10-month-old infants training observing a novel action and performing a separate novel action over the course of a week. They found that infants had greater mu desynchronization to observation of the executed actions compared to the only observed novel actions. Taken together, these studies show that motor experience, rather than visual experience, is the driving factor in the development of mu desynchronization.

100 To date, no study has reported EEG mu suppression to execution or observation of actions in
101 newborn humans; however, there is evidence from recent EEG studies with newborn monkeys.
102 Ferrari and colleagues (2012) and Vanderwert and colleagues (2015) recorded EEG data from
103 newborn rhesus macaques during the first week of life and found desynchronization of the 5–7 Hz
104 frequency band during both imitation and observation of lipsmacking and tongue protrusion gestures,
105 in electrodes placed approximately over the motor cortex. These findings suggest that, at least in
106 newborn monkeys, an action-perception coupling system for facial gestures is already active shortly
107 after birth.

108 During the first month of life, newborn macaques exhibit fundamental developmental changes
109 in their motor system. Improvements in hand reaching-grasping movements occur from the second
110 to the fourth week of life, as the precision of grasping actions matures and infants more accurately
111 move their body in relation to the surrounding space (Sclafani et al., 2015). This suggests that the
112 first weeks of life are a critical period for infant macaques' sensorimotor development and also marks
113 a crucial period for the investigation of emerging neural mechanisms underlying the action-perception
114 coupling. In the current study, we acquired EEG activity from newborn monkeys during the first and
115 second weeks of life, while they observed grasping actions, mimed grasps and means-end
116 movements. Based on previous EEG studies investigating the mu rhythm on infant and adult monkeys
117 (Coudé et al., 2014; Ferrari et al., 2012), we focused on two frequency bands: 1) alpha (5-7 Hz) and
118 2) beta (15-17 Hz). We also compared, amongst a subset of infants, the relation between infants'
119 motor experience and their EEG cortical activity during action observation. We hypothesized that
120 improvements in goal-directed reaching-grasping behaviors over the first two weeks would coincide
121 with the emergence of the MNS, indexed by desynchronization in the sensorimotor alpha and beta
122 rhythms, for observed grasping actions.

123

1.2 Materials and methods

1.2.1 Subjects

We tested a sample of 56 infant rhesus macaques (*Macaca mulatta*), 36 males and 20 females, born and reared at the Laboratory of Comparative Ethology at the National Institutes of Health. All infants were separated from their mothers on the first day postpartum and reared in a nursery facility for unrelated research studies. Infants were individually housed in incubators (51 cm × 38 cm × 43 cm) containing a cloth surrogate mother and various toys (for further details about rearing procedures, see Simpson et al., (2016)).

EEG recordings were performed at two time points: during the first week of life (W1), between day 3 and day 6 postpartum, and again during the second week of life (W2), between day 7 and day 12 postpartum. Eleven infants were tested twice during W1, thus, the mean EEG value between the two recording days was calculated for each electrode and each experimental condition. The remaining 45 infants were tested only once during W1 and once during W2. On average 5.8 days (SD = 1.6) elapsed between the first and the second EEG recording session.

Our final sample included a total of 32 infants (16 males). Twenty infants were excluded from the initial sample due to insufficient epochs of clean EEG or technical difficulties at the time of testing (N=12 at W1 and N=8 at W2) and 4 infants were excluded because they were statistical outliers (i.e., exceeded +/-2.5 SD from the mean in one or more conditions).

All animal care and testing were conducted in accordance with regulations governing the care and use of laboratory animals and had prior approval from the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committees of the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) and the University of Maryland.

1.2.2 Behavioral procedures for EEG acquisition

At the beginning of each recording session, infant monkeys were removed from their incubators and brought to a testing room for the EEG procedures. During EEG data acquisition, one experimenter held the monkey, while a second experimenter served as model and presented the stimuli in front of the monkey at a distance of approximately 35-45 cm. The experimental paradigm included three conditions (see Figure 1A): a) Grasping Condition, GC – the model grasped a red ball (6.5 cm diameter) at the end of a rod; b) Mimicking Condition, MC – the model mimicked a grasping action, in absence of the target ball; and c) Ball Condition, BC – the model moved a second red ball at the end of a rod toward the target ball. The MC was introduced to assess possible EEG oscillations related to simple biological movements rather than to the final goal of the action; the BC was designed to investigate the possible EEG modulation to the detection of non-biological but means-end motions. The order of presentation of the experimental conditions was pseudo-randomized between subjects.


Each EEG recording session started with a 40-second static baseline where a red target ball was statically presented, followed by the presentation of the three experimental stimuli. Each stimulus was repeatedly presented over a period of 20 seconds, at a pace of 0.5 Hz; and the sequence GC-MC-BC was repeated twice over the recording session, for a total duration of 40 seconds for each stimulus. The experimental design is illustrated in Figure 1B.

An experimenter wearing a surgical mask, cap, and goggles presented stimuli live. The red ball was presented at the end of a long (35cm) rod. Considering the attire and distance, we believe the monkeys had limited perception of the model's body/face and that it did not disturb stimuli presentation. Moreover, we assume that none of the experimental stimuli were perceived as threatening by the monkeys as, besides being attentive to them during the presentation, they sporadically attempted to grasp the red ball/s presented during the baseline and experimental conditions (GC/BC).

Each EEG recording session lasted about 10 minutes, which included the time required to cap the infant and short breaks between each stimulus presentation. Each infant participated in no more

172 than one EEG recording session per day and, if not successfully completed, testing was, if possible,
 173 repeated once within the same week.

174



175

176 **Figure1: Experimental task and design.** A: representation of baseline and experimental conditions.

177 B: description of the experimental design.

178

179 1.2.3 Behavioral coding for EEG processing

180 All testing sessions were video recorded. The video signal was recorded using a 30 Hz video
 181 camera (Sony Digital Video Camcorder ZR600, USA), positioned 0.5m behind the model, and time-
 182 stamped with a vertical integrated time code that was synchronized online with the EEG acquisition
 183 software.

184 Subsequently, two coders independently scored both the models and the monkeys' behaviors
 185 in each video. Videos were coded frame-by-frame off-line with the Video Coding System (James
 186 Long Company, NY, USA). The following infants' behaviors, during both baseline and stimuli
 187 presentation, were coded: (a) visual gaze (i.e., looking at the stimulus); (b) arm and hand movements,
 188 and (c) gross body movements. In addition, the following model's behaviors, during each stimulus
 189 presentation, were coded: (a) action begin, corresponding to the first frame in which the
 190 experimenter's hand started moving toward the target ball (GC), started the mimed action (MC) or
 191 started moving the second red ball toward the static target ball (BC), and (b) action completion,
 192 corresponding to the first frame in which the model's whole hand was in contact with the target ball

193 before moving back to the starting position (GC) or the hand was completely still before moving back
194 to the starting position (MC) or the two balls were touching and still before moving back to the
195 starting position (BC). Inter-rater agreement, within three frames (about 100 ms), was achieved on a
196 minimum 85% of each video. The start and the end times of epochs of interest in which the infant
197 was still and looking at the still target ball (during baseline) or at the presented stimuli were identified
198 within the EEG signal for data analysis.

199

200 1.2.4 EEG acquisition and data processing

201 EEG recordings were performed as previously described in Vanderwert et al. (2015) and
202 Ferrari et al. (2012). A custom lycra cap (Electro-Cap International, OH, USA) fitted with six tin
203 electrodes was used. Two anterior electrodes were placed approximately over the motor cortex (A3:
204 anterior left; A4: anterior right) and two posterior electrodes were placed approximately over the
205 parietal/occipital cortex (P3: posterior left; P4: posterior right). The vertex served as reference, while
206 an electrode located on the forehead served as ground. The choice of referencing the EEG signal to
207 the vertex was mainly due to newborn monkeys' head size resulting in a very limited area for
208 electrodes placement and thereby in a low density of electrodes.

209 At the beginning of the recording session, the monkey's head was shaved, and a mild abrading
210 gel was applied to clean the scalp and improve impedances. Impedances were measured and kept
211 below 20 k Ω .

212 The EEG signal was band-pass filtered online from 0.1 to 100 Hz, digitized with a 16-bit A/D
213 converter (± 5 V input range) at 1 KHz and recorded on a separate acquisition computer. All data
214 acquisition was performed with the James Long recording system (James Long Company, NY, USA).

215 The EEG signal was filtered, off-line, using a low pass filter with a cut off of 40 Hz. As in
216 previous infant monkey EEG studies (Ferrari et al., 2012; Vanderwert et al., 2015) artifacts were
217 automatically removed using a threshold of ± 250 μ V, in order to capture gross movement artifacts

218 while preserving good EEG signal, and then the signal was visually inspected to remove additional
219 artifacts not identified in the automatic artifact process. Artifact-free EEG epochs included in both
220 the baseline and the stimulus presentation period, specifically from the onset to the completion of the
221 action (for all experimental conditions), were submitted to a fast Fourier transform using a 1000ms
222 Hanning window, with 50% overlap. Spectral power (μV^2) was computed for 1-Hz bins from 2 to 25
223 Hz. Single hertz bins were then summed to compute two frequency bands: 5-7 Hz, alpha and 15-17
224 Hz, beta. All data processing was performed using the EEG Analysis System software (James Long
225 Company, NY, USA).

226 Computation of event-related desynchronization (ERD) and/or event-related synchronization
227 (ERS) was based on previous studies (Cannon et al., 2014; Pineda and Oberman, 2006) that used the
228 natural log of the ratio of event to baseline activity [i.e. \ln (“Event”/“Baseline”)], where “Event” is
229 the absolute power in a particular frequency band while the monkey was still and observing the
230 presented stimulus, and “Baseline” is the absolute power in a particular frequency band in which the
231 monkey was still and observing the static target ball. Negative values indicate desynchronization (i.e.,
232 decrease in band power relative to the baseline) and positive values indicate synchronization (i.e.,
233 increase in band power relative to the baseline).

234

235 1.2.5 Data analysis and statistical approach

236 Our analyses focused on two different EEG frequency bands: 5-7 Hz and 15-17 Hz, hereafter
237 referred as alpha and beta, respectively. While the choice of focusing on frequencies falling in the alpha
238 band was driven by previous investigations in newborn monkeys, showing EEG desynchronization in this
239 frequency band, during imitation and observation of facial gestures (Ferrari et al., 2012), the analysis of
240 the beta band was based on more recent EEG findings showing that in adult monkeys the beta band
241 desynchronizes during the observation and execution of grasping actions (Coudé et al., 2014; Bimbi et
242 al., *under revision*).

EEG data were analyzed by means of within-subjects repeated measures ANOVAs. Significant main effects and interactions were followed up using 2-tailed paired t-tests. The regions analyzed were as follows: anterior (A3 and A4) and posterior (P3 and P4).

A preliminary analysis was run by means of an omnibus ANOVA with Band (Alpha, Beta), Condition (GC, MC and BC), Region (Anterior, Posterior), Hemisphere (Left, Right) and Week (W1, W2) as factors. This analysis revealed a main effect of Band ($F(1, 31) = 7.576, p = 0.010, \eta_p^2 = 0.196$), with desynchronization in the beta band ($M = -0.125, SE = 0.040$) but not in the alpha band ($M = 0.042, SE = 0.049$). One sample t-tests compared to zero confirmed the absence of desynchronization in the alpha band in all conditions (GC, MC, BC), regions (Anterior and Posterior) and at both W1 and W2 (all $ps > 0.05$) except for MC at W2 which showed a significant synchronization over posterior scalp locations ($p = 0.038$). Therefore, we focused our remaining analyses on the beta band.

1.2.6 Correlation between infants' ERD and motor proficiency

Some infants showed attempts to reach and grasp during EEG testing, however the presence of excessive motor artifacts which contaminated EEG data during action execution, together with the short-term duration of each recording session and the low number of grasping actions exhibited by each infant, made it impossible to acquire the minimum number of trials required to analyze the EEG data. However, a subset of monkeys ($N = 14$) from our sample also completed a separate behavioral *Reaching-grasping task*, originally designed to investigate infants' space perception in relation to their grasping behavior maturation over the first month of life (for details on infants' behavioral grasping capacities, see Sclafani et al. (2015)). Briefly: monkeys were tested twice a week from the second to the fourth week postpartum. Each monkey was presented with a series of small and large balls, either at a reachable distance (infant's peripersonal space) or at a non-reachable distance (infant's extrapersonal space). If the infant made no grasping attempt with the ball within 20 seconds,

268 the ball was removed and the trial was terminated. Infants were presented with one ball at a time, and
269 completed up to 8 trials (2 trials for each ball size and distance). Infants could attempt to grasp with
270 different effectors, hand or mouth, and different motor strategies, stepping toward the target ball
271 before attempting to grasp it or simply extending their arm/mouth to approach the ball. In the present
272 study, we considered the number of hand grasping attempts—both successful and unsuccessful—
273 exhibited by each infant at two weeks of age, as an index of infants' grasping propensity. We chose
274 to include both successful and unsuccessful attempts in our analyses because, at this age, infants make
275 a high proportion of unsuccessful attempts as they initially develop their manual reach-grasping skills.
276 There were, however, significant individual differences in the frequencies of attempts overall, so we
277 focused on this measure. The choice of investigating hand grasping skills in relation to the EEG
278 activity only in the second week of life and not in the first week was motivated by the fact that in the
279 first week of life almost no infants attempted to reach the ball. Only in the second week of life did
280 infants start to develop a rudimentary form of grasping, even though there were significant individual
281 differences (Sclafani et al., 2015), with some individuals making attempts and others not yet
282 displaying any attempt to reach the object. We therefore considered this transition phase, from week
283 1 to week 2, as an ideal time to capture emerging neural activity during action observation. While
284 empirically interesting, further longitudinal measurements at week 3 and 4 post partum were not
285 feasible as the monkeys became too active by these ages.

286 Since data were not normally distributed we used Spearman's correlation to explore the
287 possible association between the number of hand grasping attempts exhibited by each infant at W2,
288 during the *Reaching-grasping task*, and the EEG activity recorded at the same age during the
289 observation of grasping, mimed actions and means-end movements. Bonferroni corrections were
290 applied to account for multiple comparisons.

291

1.3 Results

Preliminary analyses revealed the presence of desynchronization in the beta band but not in the alpha band. Therefore, results reported in this section will be focused on beta band only.

To examine whether there was EEG desynchronization during GC, MC, and BC, one-sample *t*-tests compared with zero were run. Analyses revealed significant ERD over anterior electrodes during W2 (GC: $t_{(31)} = -4.141, p < 0.001, d = 0.73$; MC: $t_{(31)} = -2.084, p = 0.045, d = 0.37$; BC: $t_{(31)} = -2.967, p = 0.006, d = 0.52$) but not during W1 (GC: $t_{(31)} = -1.085, p = 0.286$; MC: $t_{(31)} = -1.850, p = 0.074$; BC: $t_{(31)} = -1.940, p = 0.062$), and no significant ERD either at W1 (GC: $t_{(31)} = -0.483, p = 0.632$; MC: $t_{(31)} = -1.888, p = 0.068$; BC: $t_{(31)} = -0.994, p = 0.328$) or at W2 (GC: $t_{(31)} = -0.829, p = 0.413$; MC: $t_{(31)} = 0.811, p = 0.424$; BC: $t_{(31)} = -0.411, p = 0.684$) for posterior electrodes. Figure 2 shows mean ERDs in the beta band over anterior and posterior electrodes.

To explore the possible presence of any longitudinal effects, from W1 to W2, we implemented further analyses. Because the effect of hemisphere in preliminary analyses was not significant, we averaged ERD and ERS values across the left and right hemisphere. We implemented a 3 Condition (GC, MC and BL) x 2 Region (Anterior and posterior) x 2 Week (W1, W2) within-subject ANOVA, which revealed a main effect of Region ($F(1, 31) = 5.881, p = 0.020, \eta_p^2 = 0.159$), with greater desynchronization in anterior electrodes ($M = -0.189, SE = 0.42$) than posterior electrodes ($M = -0.061, SE = 0.053$), and a Condition x Week interaction ($F(2, 62) = 4.021, p = 0.026, \eta_p^2 = 0.156$). Follow-up paired comparisons focused only on anterior electrodes and revealed no differences between W1 and W2 in MC ($t_{(31)} = -0.183, p = 0.856$; MC_{W1} : $M = -0.181, SE = 0.098$; MC_{W2} : $M = -0.159, SE = 0.076$) and BC ($t_{(31)} = -0.253, p = 0.802$; BC_{W1} : $M = -0.170, SE = 0.088$; BC_{W2} : $M = -0.198, SE = 0.067$), while a trend was found in GC ($t_{(31)} = -1.86, p = 0.071, d = 0.33$), with more ERD in W2 ($M = -0.329, SE = 0.079$) than W1 ($M = -0.101, SE = 0.093$) (Figure 2). Follow-up paired comparisons also showed a significant difference between GC and MC at W2 ($t_{(31)} = -2.06, p = 0.048, d = 0.36$) (Figure 2), but not at W1 ($t_{(31)} = 0.79, p = 0.435$). No difference between GC and BC were found at both W1 and

W2 ($W1:t_{(31)} = 0.63, p = 0.535$; $W2:t_{(31)} = -1.46, p = 0.158$). MC and BC did not differ at either time point ($W1: t_{(31)} = 0.14, p = 0.891$; $W2: t_{(31)} = -0.494, p = 0.624$).




Figure 2: Beta Event-related desynchronization. Means and standard errors of EEG beta event-related desynchronizations (ERDs) for anterior and posterior electrodes in each condition (GC, MC, BC) and week (W1, W2). E: Event, B: Baseline. * $p < 0.05$, + $p = 0.071$.

1.3.1 Motor competence and ERD during observation of grasping actions

To investigate the relation between infants’ motor competence at 2 weeks of age and beta ERD recorded during action observation at W2, Spearman correlations were run for a subset of 14 monkeys.

For anterior electrodes, this analysis revealed a trend-significance negative correlation between the total number of hand grasping attempts exhibited by each infant at W2, during the behavioral *Reaching-grasping task*, and EEG desynchronization to observed grasping actions (Spearman correlation: $r_s(14) = -0.616, p_{corr} = 0.057$). Specifically, greater ERD in GC were associated with more grasping attempts, suggesting that infants with more mature manual motor abilities may also be exhibiting stronger sensorimotor neural activation during observation of grasping actions. No significant correlations were found between the total number of hand grasping attempts exhibited by each infant at W2 and EEG desynchronization to observed mimed actions

336 (Spearman correlation: $r_s(14) = -0.242, p = 0.404$) or observed means-end movements (Spearman
337 correlation: $r_s(14) = 0.174, p = 0.560$).

338 Similarly, no significant correlations were found between the total number of grasping
339 attempts exhibited by each monkey during the *Reaching-grasping task* and EEG values over posterior
340 electrodes in GC (Spearman correlation: $r_s(14) = 0.104, p = 0.723$), MC (Spearman correlation: r_s
341 $(14) = 0.586, p_{corr} = 0.102$) and BC (Spearman correlation: $r_s(14) = 0.202, p = 0.508$).

342 We further explored the possible relations between EEG activity recorded during grasping
343 action observation (GC) and the number of grasping attempts exhibited by each infant, during the
344 behavioral *Reaching-grasping task*, when the object was presented in the peripersonal or in the
345 extrapersonal space. In fact, compared to the peripersonal space trials, the extrapersonal space trials
346 required the infant to engage in not only grasping, but also locomotion, moving toward the ball, which
347 involve a more elaborate encoding of the surrounding space and evaluation of their body representation
348 in it. The number of grasping attempts made when the target ball was presented in the infant's
349 peripersonal space was correlated with EEG desynchronization, recorded during grasping action
350 observation (GC) (Spearman correlation: $r_s(14) = -0.735, p_{corr} = 0.009$) (Figure 3). Specifically,
351 greater desynchronization was associated with more grasping attempts. No relation was found
352 between EEG activity and the number of attempts executed in the extrapersonal space (Spearman
353 correlation: $r_s(14) = -0.210, p = 0.471$).

354 Together, these results suggest that grasping motor abilities, particularly when objects are
355 available within reaching distance, are associated with EEG reactivity while observing others'
356 grasping actions.




Figure 3: Correlation between EEG beta desynchronization over the anterior scalp region and infants' propensity to grasp: Negative correlation between ERD values and the number of hand grasping attempts exhibited in the peripersonal space at W2 ($p < 0.05$). The x-axis corresponds to the number of grasping attempts exhibited by each monkey- during a separate behavioral task- when the object was presented in the infant's peripersonal space. The y-axis is the beta ERD recorded over anterior electrodes at W2.

1.4 Discussion

In the current study, we acquired EEG data on newborn macaque monkeys while they observed grasping actions, mimed actions and means-end motions. In a subset of monkeys, we also examined the relations between EEG reactivity and the emergence of infants' manual motor skills. To track any possible longitudinal development, we performed EEG recordings at two different time points: during the first and second week postpartum (W1 and W2) and, following previous EEG studies in human infants (Cannon et al., 2016; Southgate et al., 2010; van Elk et al., 2008; Yoo et al., 2015) and, in infant (Ferrari et al., 2012) and adult (Coudé et al., 2014) monkeys, we focused analyses on two specific frequency bands, representing the main components of the mu rhythm: alpha, 5-7Hz, and beta, 15-17Hz.

375 In newborn monkeys, the first month of life represents a crucial transitional stage for
376 developing reaching-grasping movements, with the greatest motor changes occurring between the
377 second and the third week. During this period, infants start showing successful motor strategies to
378 reach and grasp objects in the surrounding environment (Sclafani et al., 2015). Therefore, we
379 hypothesized that rudimentary cortical mechanisms underlying the perception of others' manual
380 actions may emerge and operate in parallel with improvements in infants' hand motor skills. In
381 particular, our goal was to observe the possible emergence of neural modulations to action
382 observation, from the first week of life, when there is almost total absence of grasping abilities
383 (Sclafani et al., 2015), to the second week of life, when a rough propensity to approach objects
384 emerges.

385 Our results confirmed our hypothesis identifying desynchronization in the beta band in
386 anterior electrodes during the observation of grasping actions that is enhanced between the first and
387 second week of life. Importantly, this desynchronization coincided with the emergence of the
388 propensity to engage with objects, between the first and the second week and was greatest for
389 observation of grasping actions compared to the observation of mimed action or means-end motions.

390 These results are consistent in both their spectral and topographical characteristics with
391 previous human EEG studies, involving infants or adults, in which EEG mu desynchronization to
392 action observation has been described in electrodes placed over motor areas and in frequencies
393 belonging to the beta band range (Avanzini et al., 2012; Babiloni et al., 2002; van Elk et al., 2008).
394 Findings in the present study are also consistent with EEG investigations in adult monkeys showing
395 that the observation of grasping actions produces EEG desynchronization over frontal and central
396 scalp regions in the beta band more than in the alpha band (Coudé et al., 2014).

397 Importantly, our data represent the first evidence showing EEG reactivity to the observation
398 of hand goal-directed actions as early as the second week of life. The only other neurophysiological
399 evidence concerning the emergence of a neural system underlying action and perception right after birth
400 comes from previous EEG investigations in neonate monkeys (Ferrari et al., 2012; Vanderwert et al.,

2015). These studies showed a distinct EEG suppression of the 5-7 Hz band during imitation and execution of communicative facial gestures (i.e., lip smacking and tongue protrusion). Thus, it has been proposed that a rudimentary mirror mechanism underlying imitation may operate very early in development and may even be pre-formed in utero (Casile et al., 2011; Simpson et al., 2014; Vanderwert et al., 2013). However, it is important to note that, compared to oro-facial movements, the development of arm and hand movements requires a more complex and longer maturation processes after birth. For example, in both humans and monkeys, the myelination process of the corticospinal tract, which plays a primary role in the development of voluntary arm movements (Galea and Darian-Smith, 1995; Lemon, 1999) is completed only between the second and the third year of life (Olivier et al., 1997). Although newborn monkeys display only exploratory movements in the first week of life, such space exploration greatly contributes to the initial development of their visual-motor coordination, proprioception and internal representation of space (Sclafani et al., 2015; von Hofsten, 2004), and all these factors together may contribute to the later development of successful goal-directed reaching-grasping actions (Nelson et al., 2011; Sclafani et al., 2015). Further, these neurodevelopmental processes likely contribute to the emergence of desynchronization in the beta band during observation of actions in anterior scalp locations, along with the emerging cortical networks involved in action execution.

Our results also support the idea that the observation of others' actions recruits mirror neuron populations hosted in the ventral premotor cortex, in the primary motor cortex, and in the posterior parietal lobe (Bonini et al., 2010; Fogassi et al., 2005; Gallese et al., 1996; Vigneswaran et al., 2013), and therefore raise the possibility that, even at this early developmental stage, a mirror mechanism, probably still broadly tuned, may be emerging. This hypothesis remains speculative, however, two lines of evidence support this conclusion. First, beta desynchronization is greater for goal-directed actions than for observed mimed action and, although we did not find any significant differences in the beta desynchronization between grasping action observation and means-end movement observation, it is plausible that this latter condition relies on multiple factors, including the final goal,

427 the presence of multiple objects (two red balls versus one), and the movement of an interesting object
428 rather than the model's hand. Evidence at the single cell level in adult monkeys reveals that F5 and
429 PFG mirror neurons respond predominantly to goal-directed action rather than mimed actions (Ferrari
430 et al., 2005; Gallese et al., 1996; Rozzi et al., 2008). Data at the single cell level are not available in
431 infant monkeys and therefore we cannot infer whether the neuronal activation to specific visual
432 stimuli is similar to that of adults. Our EEG data, however, suggest that the cortical network recruited
433 in infants during action observation shares similar stimulus-response properties in frequency and
434 distribution of activity recorded from the scalp in adults.

435 Second, not surprisingly, we did not find any desynchronization during the first week of life
436 when reaching-grasping attempts are very sporadic and movements do not appear to be voluntarily
437 controlled (Sclafani et al., 2015). Our data, thus, reflect the changes occurring at the behavioral and neural
438 levels, suggesting that a rudimentary cortical system involved in action observation and execution starts
439 operating along with significant improvements in motor skills as well as the development of specific
440 cortical visual-motor integrations. As infant macaques start developing reach and grasp skills by the
441 second week of life, the EEG brain responses become more tuned for goal-directed actions and this,
442 according to our hypothesis, reflects a more mature organization of cortical motor areas which are
443 capable not only of supporting hand actions, but also involved in the decoding of others' actions in
444 terms of goals.

445 Unfortunately, we were unable to analyze the EEG data during action execution. Limited
446 testing time and the excessive artifact contamination that characterized the EEG signal during infants'
447 spontaneous reaching-grasping movements resulted in an inability to assess whether
448 desynchronization occurred in the same frequencies for action execution and observation. However,
449 the relation between EEG beta desynchronization, found during observation of grasping actions and
450 infants' motor skills (i.e., *grasping attempts*) in a subset of monkeys, provides some clues to a pairing
451 of execution and observation of actions at the neural level. Our analysis showed that infants who
452 made more reaching-grasping attempts to the target ball had greater beta desynchronization over

453 **motor-related brain regions**. Moreover, this correlation was specific for grasping attempts made in
454 the peripersonal but not the extrapersonal space, confirming what has been previously demonstrated
455 in monkeys (Sclafani et al., 2015) and in human infant studies (Rochat & Goubet, 1995) showing that
456 although infants progressively increase their body representation in the space along with their motor
457 abilities, they might detect the distance at which an object can be reached concurrently with the
458 emergence of the motor reaching and grasping skills. Attempts to grasp, thus, represent a marker of
459 neurodevelopment in infants revealing the capacity to coordinate movements requiring complex
460 visual processing and visuomotor coordination in space. This capacity is known to heavily rely on
461 parietal-premotor circuits and on the maturation of the corticospinal tract (Lemon, 1999; Olivier et
462 al., 1997; Rizzolatti and Luppino, 2001). It is possible that individuals who show reaching-grasping
463 **propensity** have more mature cortical circuits compared to those who are unable or uninterested in
464 attempting to grasp; consistently with an emerging body of evidence from human developmental EEG
465 studies (Cannon et al., 2016; van Elk et al., 2008; Yoo et al., 2015). Our data suggest that parietal and
466 premotor circuits start their maturation and refinement between the first and second week, as reflected
467 in the emergence of EEG responses during grasping observation, and their association with infants'
468 readiness to attempt to grasp, especially when objects are located in peripersonal space. **It is in fact**
469 **reasonable to think that at this developmental stage grasping attempts made within the peripersonal**
470 **space would better correlate with ERD to grasping observation, as they would reflect the activation**
471 **of more refined neural circuits also hypothetically activated during action observation. In contrast,**
472 **attempts to grasp when an object is presented in the extrapersonal space are more sporadic at this age**
473 **(Sclafani et al., 2015) and this might reflect the fact that some of the parietal-premotor circuits**
474 **involved in reaching and in space coding are not yet fully developed and still require sensorimotor**
475 **experience to be refined and become functional.**

476 In contrast to previous newborn monkey EEG investigations (Ferrari et al., 2012; Vanderwert
477 et al., 2015), we did not find any significant desynchronization in the sensorimotor alpha band. A
478 possible explanation for this apparent discrepancy might be related to the type of effector used (hand

479 versus mouth) and/or the value (social versus non-social) of the actions assessed in the two different
480 studies. While Ferrari and colleagues (2012) recorded EEG during a facial neonatal imitation task,
481 the current study included stimuli involving hand reaching-grasping actions. Thus, the
482 desynchronization in the alpha band might reflect the recruitment of pre-formed circuits activated by
483 oro-facial gestures with communicative values (i.e., lipsmacking and tongue protrusion); conversely
484 the observation of goal-directed actions may reflect the activation of circuits still under development,
485 involving premotor and motor hand cortical regions requiring a longer period of maturation before
486 becoming adult-like. Electrophysiological studies in adult monkeys show that mouth and hand mirror
487 neurons are distributed in different, yet partially overlapping, neuroanatomical sectors within the
488 ventral premotor cortex, with the hand represented predominantly in the most medial part of F5 and
489 the mouth neurons distributed in the lateral sector of the F5 convexity (Ferrari et al., 2003; Maranesi
490 et al., 2012). Neuroimaging studies in human adults report that observing mouth actions activates a
491 more lateral sector of the premotor cortex than observing hand actions (Buccino et al., 2001). Thus,
492 although highly interconnected, mouth and hand mirror neurons could rely on different and only
493 partially overlapped cortical networks, very early in development (Casile et al., 2011).

494 From a developmental perspective, it is possible that cortical mouth circuits are already
495 present at birth and subsequently shaped by *social* experience (Casile et al., 2011; Tramacere and
496 Ferrari, 2016; Vanderwert et al., 2015) while hand cortical circuits, although present at birth, may
497 undergo finer and slower development relying more heavily on body maturation and *motor*
498 experience (Gerson et al., 2015). This interpretation would also be partially in line with more recent
499 views on the development of mirror neuron systems which support the idea that action observation
500 might benefit from experience as a result of associative learning processes and maturational processes
501 that are canalized during development (Cook et al., 2014; Del Giudice et al., 2009; Ferrari et al.,
502 2013; Heyes, 2013, 2010; Tramacere and Ferrari, 2016). Therefore, ERD to grasping action
503 observation emerging at the second week of life would be sustained by the emergence of grasping
504 motor skills and modulated by grasping experience.

505 The functionality of the alpha and beta bands may further represent developmental markers
506 for maturation of the mirror neuron system. The alpha band, therefore, may reflect the activation of
507 broader parieto-frontal circuits integrating the activity of other areas besides the motor regions that
508 might require a longer period of time for myelination processes. Thus, it is possible that the reactivity
509 of alpha frequencies to others' hand actions might emerge at later ages as a result of greater motor
510 experience, compared to the beta band. In line with this hypothesis, it has been shown that the two
511 frequency bands originate from different cortical sources, with beta band having its cortical source in
512 the motor cortex and the alpha band originating from the post-central gyrus (Hari and Salmelin,
513 1997). This suggests that local circuits, restricted to the motor and premotor cortex, may develop and
514 integrate information reflected in the EEG modulation earlier than later developing complex networks
515 involving fronto-parietal connections. Moreover, a recent neurophysiological investigation using
516 simultaneous EEG and single neurons recordings (Bimbi et al., *under revision*) in adult monkeys,
517 demonstrated that F5 mirror neurons activity correlated with EEG desynchronization to grasping
518 action observation in the beta band but not in the alpha band. Thus, it is possible that the major
519 contribution of mirror neurons to the beta band desynchronization recorded over anterior and central
520 scalp locations is already present at this early developmental stage.

521 In conclusion, our findings suggest that EEG beta band suppression recorded over the scalp
522 may represent a marker of the activation of cortical networks, probably including mirror neurons,
523 underlying goal-directed hand action perception, starting from the second week of life, and develop
524 along with the emergence of grasping motor skills.

525

526

527 **Acknowledgements**

528 This research was supported by the National Institutes of Health (NICHD and NIH P01HD064653).

1.5 References

- Avanzini, P., Fabbri-Destro, M., Dalla Volta, R., Daprati, E., Rizzolatti, G., Cantalupo, G., 2012. The dynamics of sensorimotor cortical oscillations during the observation of hand movements: An EEG study. *PLoS One* 7, e37534. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0037534
- Babiloni, C., Babiloni, F., Carducci, F., Cincotti, F., Coccozza, G., Del Percio, C., Moretti, D. V., Rossini, P.M., 2002. Human cortical electroencephalography (EEG) rhythms during the observation of simple aimless movements: a high-resolution EEG study. *Neuroimage* 17, 559–572.
- Bimbi, M., Festante, F., Coudé, G., Vanderwert, R.E., Fox, N.A., Ferrari, P.F., *under revision*. Simultaneous scalp recorded EEG and multiunit recording from monkey ventral premotor cortex during action observation and execution reveals the contribution of mirror and motor neurons to the mu-rhythm. *Neuroimage*.
- Bonini, L., Rozzi, S., Serventi, F.U., Simone, L., Ferrari, P.F., Fogassi, L., 2010. Ventral premotor and inferior parietal cortices make distinct contribution to action organization and intention understanding. *Cereb. Cortex* 20, 1372–1385. doi:10.1093/cercor/bhp200
- Buccino, G., Binkofski, F., Fink, G.R., Fadiga, L., Fogassi, L., Gallese, V., Seitz, R.J., Zilles, K., Rizzolatti, G., Freund, H.J., 2001. Action observation activates premotor and parietal areas in a somatotopic manner: An fMRI study. *Eur. J. Neurosci.* 13, 400–404. doi:10.1046/j.1460-9568.2001.01385.x
- Cannon, E.N., Simpson, E. a., Fox, N. a., Vanderwert, R.E., Woodward, A.L., Ferrari, P.F., 2016. Relations between infants’ emerging reach-grasp competence and event-related desynchronization in EEG. *Dev. Sci.* 19, 50–62. doi:10.1111/desc.12295
- Cannon, E.N., Yoo, K.H., Vanderwert, R.E., Ferrari, P.F., Woodward, A.L., Fox, N.A., 2014. Action experience, more than observation, influences mu rhythm desynchronization. *PLoS One* 9, e92002. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0092002
- Casile, A., Caggiano, V., Ferrari, P.F., 2011. The mirror neuron system: a fresh view. *Neuroscientist* 17, 524–38. doi:10.1177/1073858410392239
- Cook, R., Bird, G., Catmur, C., Press, C., Heyes, C., 2014. Mirror neurons: From origin to function. *Behav Brain Sci* 37, 177–192. doi:10.1017/s0140525x13000903
- Coudé, G., Vanderwert, R.E., Thorpe, S., Festante, F., Bimbi, M., Fox, N. a, Ferrari, P.F., 2014. Frequency and topography in monkey electroencephalogram during action observation: possible neural correlates of the mirror neuron system. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B. Biol. Sci.* 369, 20130415. doi:10.1098/rstb.2013.0415
- Del Giudice, M., Manera, V., Keysers, C., 2009. Programmed to learn? the ontogeny of mirror

neurons. *Dev. Sci.* 12, 350–363. doi:10.1111/j.1467-7687.2008.00783.x

di Pellegrino, G., Fadiga, L., Fogassi, L., Gallese, V., Rizzolatti, G., 1992. Understanding motor events: a neurophysiological study. *Exp. brain Res.* 91, 176–180. doi:10.1007/BF00230027

Ferrari, P.F., Gallese, V., Rizzolatti, G., Fogassi, L., 2003. Mirror neurons responding to the observation of ingestive and communicative mouth actions in the monkey ventral premotor cortex. *Eur. J. Neurosci.* 17, 1703–1714. doi:10.1046/j.1460-9568.2003.02601.x

Ferrari, P.F., Paukner, A., Ruggiero, A., Darcey, L., Unbehagen, S., Suomi, S.J., 2009. Interindividual differences in neonatal imitation and the development of action chains in rhesus macaques. *Child Dev.* 80, 1057–1068. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2009.01316.x

Ferrari, P.F., Rozzi, S., Fogassi, L., 2005. Mirror Neurons Responding to Observation of Actions Made with Tools in Monkey Ventral Premotor Cortex. *J. Cogn. Neurosci.* 17, 212–226. doi:10.1162/0898929053124910

Ferrari, P.F., Tramacere, A., Simpson, E.A., Iriki, A., 2013. Mirror neurons through the lens of epigenetics. *Trends Cogn. Sci.* doi:10.1016/j.tics.2013.07.003

Ferrari, P.F., Vanderwert, R.E., Paukner, A., Bower, S., Suomi, S.J., Fox, N. a, 2012. Distinct EEG amplitude suppression to facial gestures as evidence for a mirror mechanism in newborn monkeys. *J. Cogn. Neurosci.* 24, 1165–72. doi:10.1162/jocn_a_00198

Fogassi, L., Ferrari, P.F., Gesierich, B., Rozzi, S., Chersi, F., Rizzolatti, G., 2005. Parietal lobe: from action organization to intention understanding. *Science* 308, 662–667. doi:10.1126/science.1106138

Fox, N.A., Bakermans-Kranenburg, M.J., Yoo, K.H., Bowman, L.C., Cannon, E.N., Vanderwert, R.E., Ferrari, P.F., Van Ijzendoorn, M.H., 2016. Assessing Human Mirror Activity With EEG Mu Rhythm: A Meta-Analysis. *Psychol. Bull.* 142, 291–313. doi:10.1037/bul0000031

Galea, M.P., Darian-Smith, I., 1995. Postnatal maturation of the direct corticospinal projections in the macaque monkey. *Cereb. Cortex* 5, 518–540. doi:10.1093/cercor/5.6.518

Gallese, V., Fadiga, L., Fogassi, L., Rizzolatti, G., 1996. Action recognition in the premotor cortex. *Brain* 119, 593–609. doi:10.1093/brain/119.2.593

Gerson, S.A., Bekkering, H., Hunnius, S., 2015. Short-term Motor Training, but Not Observational Training, Alters Neurocognitive Mechanisms of Action Processing in Infancy. *J. Cogn. Neurosci.* 27, 1207–1214. doi:10.1162/jocn_a_00774

Hari, R., Salmelin, R., 1997. Human cortical oscillations: A neuromagnetic view through the skull. *Trends Neurosci.* doi:10.1016/S0166-2236(96)10065-5

Heyes, C., 2013. A new approach to mirror neurons: Developmental history, system-level theory and intervention experiments. *Cortex.* doi:10.1016/j.cortex.2013.07.002

597 Heyes, C., 2010. Where do mirror neurons come from? *Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev.*
 598 doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2009.11.007
 599 Hunnius, S., Bekkering, H., 2014. What are you doing? How active and observational experience
 600 shape infants' action understanding. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* 369, 20130490.
 601 doi:10.1098/rstb.2013.0490
 602 Kaburu, S.S.K., Paukner, A., Simpson, E.A., Suomi, S.J., Ferrari, P.F., 2016. Neonatal imitation
 603 predicts infant rhesus macaque (*Macaca mulatta*) social and anxiety-related behaviours at one
 604 year. *Sci. Rep.* 6, 34997. doi:10.1038/srep34997
 605 Lemon, R.N., 1999. Neural control of dexterity: What has been achieved? *Exp. Brain Res.* 128, 6–
 606 12. doi:10.1007/s002210050811
 607 Maranesi, M., Rodà, F., Bonini, L., Rozzi, S., Ferrari, P.F., Fogassi, L., Coudé, G., 2012. Anatomico-
 608 functional organization of the ventral primary motor and premotor cortex in the macaque
 609 monkey. *Eur. J. Neurosci.* 36, 3376–3387. doi:10.1111/j.1460-9568.2012.08252.x
 610 Marshall, P.J., Bar-Haim, Y., Fox, N.A., 2002. Development of the EEG from 5 months to 4 years of
 611 age. *Clin. Neurophysiol.* 113, 1199–1208. doi:10.1016/S1388-2457(02)00163-3
 612 Marshall, P.J., Meltzoff, A.N., 2014. Neural mirroring mechanisms and imitation in human infants.
 613 *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B. Biol. Sci.* 369, 20130620. doi:10.1098/rstb.2013.0620
 614 Marshall, P.J., Meltzoff, A.N., 2011. Neural mirroring systems: exploring the EEG mu rhythm in
 615 human infancy. *Dev. Cogn. Neurosci.* 1, 110–23. doi:10.1016/j.dcn.2010.09.001
 616 Muthukumaraswamy, S.D., Johnson, B.W., 2004. Changes in rolandic mu rhythm during observation
 617 of a precision grip. *Psychophysiology* 41, 152–156. doi:10.1046/j.1469-8986.2003.00129.x
 618 Nelson, E.L., Emery, M.S., Babcock, S.M., Novak, M.F.S.X., Suomi, S.J., Novak, M.A., 2011. Head
 619 orientation and handedness trajectory in rhesus monkey infants (*Macaca mulatta*). *Dev.*
 620 *Psychobiol.* 53, 246–255. doi:10.1002/dev.20517
 621 Neuper, C., Pfurtscheller, G., 2001. Event-related dynamics of cortical rhythms: Frequency-specific
 622 features and functional correlates, in: *International Journal of Psychophysiology*. pp. 41–58.
 623 doi:10.1016/S0167-8760(01)00178-7
 624 Nyström, P., Ljunghammar, T., Rosander, K., Von Hofsten, C., 2011. Using mu rhythm
 625 desynchronization to measure mirror neuron activity in infants. *Dev. Sci.* 14, 327–335.
 626 doi:10.1111/j.1467-7687.2010.00979.x
 627 Olivier, E., Edgley, S.A., Armand, J., Lemon, R.N., 1997. An electrophysiological study of the
 628 postnatal development of the corticospinal system in the macaque monkey. *J. Neurosci.* 17, 267–
 629 76.
 630 Pineda, J.A., 2005. The functional significance of mu rhythms: Translating “seeing” and “hearing”

631 into “doing.” *Brain Res. Rev.* doi:10.1016/j.brainresrev.2005.04.005

632 Pineda, J.A., Oberman, L.M., 2006. What goads cigarette smokers to smoke? Neural adaptation and
633 the mirror neuron system. *Brain Res.* 1121, 128–135. doi:10.1016/j.brainres.2006.08.128

634 Rizzolatti, G., Fogassi, L., Gallese, V., 2001. Neurophysiological mechanisms underlying the
635 understanding and imitation of action. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* 2, 661–70. doi:10.1038/35090060

636 Rizzolatti, G., Luppino, G., 2001. The cortical motor system. *Neuron.* doi:10.1016/S0896-
637 6273(01)00423-8

638 Rochat, P., Goubet, N., 1995. Development of sitting and reaching in 5- to 6-month-old infants. *Infant*
639 *Behav. Dev.* 18, 53–68. doi:10.1016/0163-6383(95)90007-1

640 Rozzi, S., Ferrari, P.F., Bonini, L., Rizzolatti, G., Fogassi, L., 2008. Functional organization of
641 inferior parietal lobule convexity in the macaque monkey: electrophysiological characterization
642 of motor, sensory and mirror responses and their correlation with cytoarchitectonic areas. *Eur.*
643 *J. Neurosci.* 28, 1569–88. doi:10.1111/j.1460-9568.2008.06395.x

644 Sclafani, V., Simpson, E.A., Suomi, S.J., Ferrari, P.F., 2015. Development of space perception in
645 relation to the maturation of the motor system in infant rhesus macaques (*Macaca mulatta*).
646 *Neuropsychologia* 70, 429–441. doi:10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2014.12.002

647 Simpson, E.A., Miller, G.M., Ferrari, P.F., Suomi, S.J., Paukner, A., 2016. Neonatal imitation and
648 early social experience predict gaze following abilities in infant macaques. *Sci. Rep.* 1–14.
649 doi:10.1038/srep20233

650 Simpson, E.A., Murray, L., Paukner, A., Ferrari, P.F., 2014. The mirror neuron system as revealed
651 through neonatal imitation: presence from birth, predictive power and evidence of plasticity.
652 *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* 369, 20130289–20130289. doi:10.1098/rstb.2013.0289

653 Sommerville, J.A., Woodward, A.L., Needham, A., 2005. Action experience alters 3-month-old
654 infants’ perception of others’ actions. *Cognition* 96, B1–B11.
655 doi:10.1016/j.cognition.2004.07.004

656 Southgate, V., Johnson, M.H., El Karoui, I., Csibra, G., 2010. Motor system activation reveals
657 infants’ on-line prediction of others’ goals. *Psychol. Sci. a J. Am. Psychol. Soc. / APS* 21, 355–
658 359. doi:10.1177/0956797610362058

659 Southgate, V., Johnson, M.H., Osborne, T., Csibra, G., 2009. Predictive motor activation during
660 action observation in human infants. *Biol. Lett.* 5, 769–772. doi:10.1098/rsbl.2009.0474

661 Thorpe, S.G., Cannon, E.N., Fox, N.A., 2016. Spectral and source structural development of mu and
662 alpha rhythms from infancy through adulthood. *Clin. Neurophysiol.* 127, 254–269.
663 doi:10.1016/j.clinph.2015.03.004

664 Tramacere, A., Ferrari, P.F., 2016. Faces in the mirror, from the neuroscience of mimicry to the

665 emergence of mentalizing. *J. Anthropol. Sci.* 94, 113–126. doi:10.4436/jass.94037
 666 van Elk, M., van Schie, H.T., Hunnius, S., Vesper, C., Bekkering, H., 2008. You'll never crawl alone:
 667 Neurophysiological evidence for experience-dependent motor resonance in infancy.
 668 *Neuroimage* 43, 808–814. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2008.07.057
 669 Vanderwert, R.E., Fox, N. a, Ferrari, P.F., 2013. The mirror mechanism and mu rhythm in social
 670 development. *Neurosci. Lett.* 1–6. doi:10.1016/j.neulet.2012.10.006
 671 Vanderwert, R.E., Simpson, E.A., Paukner, A., Suomi, S.J., Fox, N.A., Ferrari, P.F., 2015. Early
 672 Social Experience Affects Neural Activity to Affiliative Facial Gestures in Newborn Nonhuman
 673 Primates. *Dev. Neurosci.* 37, 243–252. doi:10.1159/000381538
 674 Vigneswaran, G., Philipp, R., Lemon, R.N., Kraskov, A., 2013. M1 corticospinal mirror neurons and
 675 their role in movement suppression during action observation. *Curr. Biol.* 23, 236–243.
 676 doi:10.1016/j.cub.2012.12.006
 677 von Hofsten, C., 2004. An action perspective on motor development. *Trends Cogn. Sci.* 8, 266–72.
 678 doi:10.1016/j.tics.2004.04.002
 679 Woodward, A.L., Gerson, S.A., 2014. Mirroring and the development of action understanding.
 680 *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B. Biol. Sci.* 369, 20130181. doi:10.1098/rstb.2013.0181
 681 Yoo, K.H., Cannon, E.N., Thorpe, S.G., Fox, N. a., 2015. Desynchronization in EEG during
 682 perception of means-end actions and relations with infants' grasping skill. *Br. J. Dev. Psychol.*
 683 n/a-n/a. doi:10.1111/bjdp.12115
 684